97-84083-3

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment

Finland's prohibition

Washington, D.C.

1930

97-84083-3
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z Association against the prohibition amendment.
Box 284 Finland's prohibition, an echo of Volsteadism, prepared by the National association against the prohibition amendment ... Research department, John C. Gebhart, director. Washington [Association against the prohibition amendment] 1930.
cover-title, 36 p. 22½ x 9½ cm.

Another copy in Law Library.

18827

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 9:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 5-9-97 INITIALS: AB

TRACKING # : 24053

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Finland's Prohibition:

An Echo of Volsteadism

Prepared by the
ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

308
Z
Box 284

Research Department
JOHN C. GEBHART, *Director*

Published June, 1930

DEC 13 1932

July 8, 1930 DA/H2c

Finland's Prohibition: An Echo of Volsteadism

FINLAND and the United States are the only Prohibition countries in the civilized World. We took steps in 1929 to find out how the dry laws were working in the little Baltic Republic, which has an area of about 150,000 square miles, chiefly lakes and woodland, and a population of approximately 3,600,000. The inquiry was made by an American academician thoroughly conversant with the Finnish language. His findings show that the liquor situation is astonishingly like that in the United States. Here are a few of the high lights:

1. Convictions for Prohibition violations rose from 10,563 in 1920 to 22,374 in 1927. (The absolute Prohibition law became operative in June, 1919.*)
2. Sales of liquors and alcohol by the State Alcohol Corporation, theoretically for non-beverage purposes, rose from 845,800 litres (223,422 U. S. gallons) in 1920 to 5,001,600 litres (1,321,311 U. S. gallons) in 1927. (Litre totals given in terms of 100 per cent alcohol.)
3. Drunkenness convictions have gone up from 21,184 in 1920 to 78,252 in 1927.
4. Crime convictions in general numbered 37,104 in 1919 and 126,860 in 1927.
5. Seizures of illicit liquor have increased from approximately 200,000 litres in 1922 to 1,000,000 in 1927.
6. After four revisions of the dry law and various reorganizations of enforcement agencies, Prohibitionists still insist that the law, ten years in operation, has not had a fair trial, that officials are not enforcing its provisions, and that there must not be a national referendum on repeal or retention.

This report contains a review of steps taken by international Prohibitionists to enlist the aid of the League of Nations in their crusade against intoxicants. That movement was defeated at a time when a dry propagandist agency had offered

* Absolute prohibition, as defined by the Finnish law and as the term is used in this pamphlet, means that no liquor of more than 2 per cent alcoholic content shall be imported, sold, transported or stored, except for medical, scientific or technical purposes, and that the sole right of import or manufacture shall be vested in the State.

the League its services for the gathering of information on the drink question.

Review of Finnish Liquor Laws

Finns boasted for years prior to Prohibition that theirs was the most sober nation in Europe. A review of their liquor legislation during the last century shows that the trade in intoxicants receded steadily, step by step, in the face of a series of restrictive laws, up to the time the country adopted absolute Prohibition in 1919.

Back in 1800, a tax was laid on landowners and burghers for the right to make intoxicants, whether or not they availed themselves of that right. In 1829, the quantities they could produce were limited by law, and heavy fines were prescribed for drunkenness. There was a further effort to reduce production in 1841, when the tax was lifted from those who surrendered the right to distill. Comparatively few persons claimed the exemption, but in 1856 production was cut in half by means of a law limiting the period in which stills could be operated to one and a half months a year.

A law of 1863 prohibited all home manufacture, set up a licensing system for distilling, enabled rural districts to bar both distilleries and shops for sale of liquor, and provided for two-year sales licenses in cities, where hotels and restaurants were permitted to serve spirits with meals only. By 1885, nearly all of the liquor trade was carried on by concerns operating under the "Gothenburg plan," i.e., limited dividend companies under State supervision.

Local Option Introduced

Prior to 1885, legislation to promote temperance had been directed against spirits only. It had been so successful that the Friends of Temperance, established in 1884, turned their attention to beer, which was fast gaining popularity. This organization drew State subsidies for many years. Several petitions for total Prohibition were introduced in the Diet in 1885. A law was passed which forbade sales of liquor of more than 25 per cent alcoholic content in rural communities, with a few unimportant exceptions, and set up Local Option for two-year periods in the cities. Four years later (1889), domestic taxes on liquor were increased.

A liquor law of 1891 established regulations which, with minor changes, remained in force up to the time of "Prohibition." This measure of

1891 forbade sales of liquor of 22 per cent alcoholic content, or more, in all cities except those granting two-per monopolies, and provided that 60 per cent of the profits must go to local public institutions and the rest to the State.

The Prohibition question, early in the present century, became enmeshed with a political issue, —Russification, or Muscovite domination. A Prohibition bill was passed by the Diet, only to be killed by the Senate, in 1907, but in 1909 a similar measure was ratified by both bodies and required only the signature of the Russian Czar to become effective. The Czar refused to sign. Promulgation was refused also in 1911 and again in 1914. This frustration of a national decree by the Imperial government infringed the rights of Finland, which was an autonomous Grand Duchy of Russia. In 1917, the Czarist régime fell, and the Kerensky administration went into power. The Finnish Prohibition law, which was then promulgated to become effective on June 1, 1919, has consequently some significance as an expression of Finland's independence.

Gains in Sobriety Before 1919

Statistics in respect to liquor, for the pre-Prohibition period, present some evidence of improving conditions before 1919. Prior to 1910, Finland had the lowest rate of liquor consumption of any country in Europe. The official figures for consumption of all alcoholic beverages—which are approximately correct, although they are defective in minor points as to imported liquors and, prior to 1893, as to quantities turned into denatured alcohol—show that the total, expressed in litres of pure alcohol, declined from 5,603,300 in 1896-1900 to 1,479,500 in 1914-1918, or from 2.14 to 0.45 per capita. Comparing 1911-1913 with 1914-1918, we find that consumption of spirits dropped from 2,998,600 to 797,400; wines from 428,400 to 99,800 and malt beverages from 1,022,800 to 582,200. The totals for those two periods were respectively 4,450,000 and 1,479,500, or 1.40 litres and 0.45 litres, per capita. In 1900, per capita consumption of spirits, reduced to pure alcohol was 1.58 litres. For 1914-1918, it was only .24. (See Table I, page 24.)

Statistics compiled by official investigators comprising the Alcohol Committee show convictions for drunkenness from 1900 to 1918. This tabulation gives a total of 9,080 for 1900, which moved irregularly down to 7,230 in 1906 and rose sharply to 14,580 the following year. The totals remained above 12,000 a year until they reached their peak at 15,930 in 1913. Thereafter

they declined to 9,300 in 1914, again to 2,197 in 1915, rose to 3,094 in 1916 and fell off again to 1,720, a low record for eighteen years, in 1917. This figure was cut still further to 470 in 1918, the year preceding Prohibition. (See Table III, page 26.)

The World War (1914-1918) and a five-month Civil War in 1918 presumably had much to do with declines in those years, which therefore cannot be accepted as true indices, in our opinion. There was, however, the drop in per capita consumption from 2.14 litres, pure alcohol, in 1896-1900 to 1.40 in 1911-1913, a pre-war period, which was accompanied by a drift toward malt beverages and away from spirits, as shown by consumption totals. To that extent, at least, the Finns' boast in regard to national sobriety in pre-Prohibition days seems to be borne out.

Prohibition Law of 1919

The Prohibition law of 1919 provided that no liquor of more than 2 per cent alcoholic content should be imported, sold, transported or stored, except for medical, scientific or technical purposes, and reserved to the State the sole right of import and manufacture. The Temperance Department of the Ministry for Social Affairs was charged with administration of the law and authorized to nominate deputy sheriffs, if necessary, for enforcement, and also to select councillors, who should survey enforcement work in various parts of the country and advise local officials.

City governments and rural communities were authorized to appoint Temperance Boards composed of "temperance enthusiasts and reputable citizens." These Boards in turn could appoint supervisors to assist them, and both were empowered to conduct searches and make seizures on grant of authority by provincial governors. If such Boards or supervisors were salaried, they were to be paid out of local treasuries.

Increase in Legal Sales

How much does Finland drink?

The only dependable figures in that connection are partial, being those for sales made by the State Alcohol Corporation, which was created under Prohibition to handle the country's entire supply of alcohol, beverage and non-beverage, industrial, scientific and medicinal. How much illicit liquor is consumed, nobody knows, although the quantity is large. The Corporation's sales are

reported in litres of pure alcohol. The official totals are given in Table II, on page 25.

Astonishing figures are to be found in this table showing the State Corporation's sales to six different types of lawful purchasers. Apothecaries bought 575,600 litres in 1920, and their supply increased every year, with one exception, until in 1927 they were permitted 3,582,600 litres. In the same years, the drug stores' purchases increased ten times, or from 70,600 to 751,500. Among industrial concerns, the demand for alcohol quite outstripped industrial growth, rising from 186,600 litres to 602,400. Hospitals bought 7,000 litres in 1920 and more than five times as much (37,600) in 1927. Even churches, which required only 3,300 litres in 1920 and 2,800 in 1921, bought 18,000 in 1926 and 17,200 in 1927.

In short, the total annual sales of the State Corporation, expressed in litres of pure alcohol, have increased nearly six times, or from 845,800 in 1920 to 5,001,600 in 1927. The present figures afford some interesting comparisons with pre-Prohibition years. The per capita consumption of legal intoxicants in 1926 and 1927 was almost that of 1911-1913, the last normal (pre-war) years before absolute Prohibition, the average for 1911-1913 having been 1.40 litres, as against a rate of 1.26 in 1926 and 1.39 in 1927. These comparisons, of course, do not take into account the illicit liquor consumed under Prohibition.

Gross Abuses in Prescriptions

The enormous increase in sales of intoxicants to apothecaries has been accompanied by gross abuses in the issuing of prescriptions. The right of physicians to prescribe alcoholic beverages was unrestricted until the Prohibition law was revised in 1922, when doctors were forbidden to prescribe them, except for strictly medicinal use. Stricter regulations affecting physicians, dentists and veterinarians were adopted in June, 1928, but protests caused a modification of these rules for doctors and dentists the following year. Wider latitude also was given heads of hospitals.

An official investigation covering a fifteen-month period beginning October 1, 1922, showed that patients of city doctors needed wines more than did those of country practitioners, although pure alcohol was by far the most common intoxicant prescribed in both urban and rural regions. Physicians issued 307,140 prescriptions, or more than 700 apiece, calling for 178,600 litres of intoxicants. Of the total number of litres, 143,200

were alcohol, 29,290 were brandy, 13,000 were wine.

Veterinarians, according to the inquiry, used 195,300 prescriptions in getting 159,200 litres of alcohol for dumb sufferers. It was found that relatively few animals required the finer beverages, although some of them needed wines and, according to the investigators, a certain pig "received two bottles of Tiffon brandy, in the original package, to be taken with coffee."

Rise in Drunkenness

Official statistical publications in Finland contain records of intoxication convictions for decades, but records for arrests have been tabulated only since 1922, or three years after the Prohibition law went into effect. The figures, we believe, tell their own story.

Convictions for drunkenness rose from a total of 12,220 in 1910 to 15,930 in 1913. The year in which Prohibition went into effect brought a sharp drop, the total for 1919 having been only 5,389. In 1920, there was a rise to 21,184, which has continued in every succeeding year up to 1927, the latest for which official compilation has been published. The total for 1927 was 78,252, as against 5,389 for 1919, the first Prohibition year. (See Table IV, page 26.)

Arrests for drunkenness have risen with convictions. The record for seven years gives a total of 42,800 in 1922 and 101,040 in 1928. This increase has been steady, no year having shown a recession of the tide. The returns indicate that intemperance has spread more rapidly in the rural districts than in the cities. Arrests in cities rose 107 per cent, and in the rural regions 206 per cent. Since 1924, rural convictions have exceeded the national total of pre-Prohibition years. The total increase for the seven years ending with 1928 was 136 per cent. (See Table V, page 27.)

While Finnish Prohibitionists admit that their purpose is to make the nation sober, they contend that drunkenness is a complex social phenomenon which cannot be attributed to any one cause, least of all Prohibition, and that it has not been proved that there is a connection between the dry law and the mounting arrests and convictions.

The fact remains that convictions in 1927 represented more than fifteen times the number in 1919, the year which brought in Prohibition. The increase since 1921 has been due to some extent, presumably, to a change in the law, which charged the police with the duty of taking into custody

any person who "appears visibly intoxicated." Arrests prior to that time were not made, as a rule, unless the victim was helpless or committed a breach of the peace, according to Finnish officials.

More Victims of Alcoholism

The Friends of Temperance established in 1888 the first and only institution in Finland for the care of victims of alcoholism. In their report for 1917 they referred to the absolute Prohibition law, which was to become effective two years later, and stated: "Prohibition will gradually eliminate all need for an institution of this sort. We have already begun to make provision for the future use of the hospital."

The hospital is still in operation, and the problem of treating alcoholic patients in Finland has become more acute. Dr. J. Hagelstam, an eminent physician who is a member of the faculty of the University of Helsingfors, has noted increases in alcoholic cases in certain institutions which he has investigated, and has attributed that increase partly to heavier drinking since Prohibition went into effect and partly to the poor quality of intoxicants commonly used.

K. K. Aro, Director of the Temperance Department of the Ministry for Social Affairs, estimated in 1928 that the number of alcoholics not found in institutions ran into several thousands and urged prompt measures to reduce the problem to more manageable dimensions. In connection with a proposed law for segregation and care of alcoholics, in September, 1929, a bill cited an increasing need for legislation to remedy a social malady of growing importance.

While official statistics on alcoholism are not available in Finland, a partial record has been compiled by Dr. M. E. Ehrnrooth, a distinguished member of the Finnish medical profession and professor at the University of Helsingfors. This compilation shows, among other things, that in five psychopathic institutions the number of alcoholics increased from 134 in 1922 to 345 in 1928, and the percentage of alcoholics from 12.3 to 26.3 of the total number of patients. (See Table VI, page 27.)

Too much reliance must not be placed on the figures for years prior to 1922 for they are not for the same institutions throughout. The evidence is strong, however, that alcoholic insanity is three times as common now as it was before the war.

Violations of the Dry Law

Convictions for Prohibition violations in Finland have risen from a total of 5,280 in 1919 to 22,374 in 1927, the latest year for which official figures had been compiled at the time this inquiry was made. The year 1928 presumably has exceeded 1927, inasmuch as the arrests in 1928 totalled 28,790, as against 24,520 in 1927. A record of the number of convictions in cities and in rural communities for the years 1919-1927 will be found in Table VII, on page 28.

An itemized account, showing the respective totals for manufacture, import, sale, and possession or transportation is given in Table VIII, on page 28. This compilation shows upward curves between 1920, the first full year of Prohibition, and 1927, in convictions for import, sale, and possession or transportation. The number of convicted importers rose from 537 to 1,009; of sellers from 2,073 to 3,884, and of possessors or transporters from 4,078 to 16,258. On the other hand, the convictions for illicit manufacture dropped from 3,899 to 651. These figures, indicating that illicit distilling has become less prevalent, although the unlawful traffic has otherwise increased, support an inference that a generous supply of bootleg liquor has brought about a reduction in home production of intoxicants.

Official reports of seizures indicate that great quantities of illicit intoxicants are being dealt in. Confiscations by the Customs and the police have shown a steady annual rise from a gross total of 296,070 litres in 1922 to 1,185,990 in 1928. (See Table IX, page 29.)

As to Liquor Seizures

Finnish law restricts the operating field of Customs officers to territorial waters, islands along the coast and five kilometres inland. Within the five-kilometre border, Customs men cooperate with the police in the preventing of smuggling. Consequently, some seizures are reported to both police and Customs headquarters and are listed twice. Wets and drys agree that the amount of this duplication is between 200,000 and 300,000 litres a year. That allowance has to be made in connection with the table we present. We believe that a sound estimate of the total seizures would show an increase from approximately 200,000 litres in 1922 to not fewer than 1,000,000 in 1927.

There are no figures showing seizures by the police prior to 1922, but the Customs records

give 110,260 litres in 1920 and 72,900 in 1921—as against 985,990 in 1928.

These totals do not prove conclusively the extent of the smuggling and bootlegging trade. The drys contend that the great volume of seizures shows that comparatively little liquor seeps through, while the wets insist that only a small part of the contraband stuff is intercepted. Our own opinion is that if the steady rise in seizures, year by year, were proving efficacious, the illicit liquor trade would pine away and finally die out, for want of financial nutrition. It seems hardly possible that the upward curves in seizures would be maintained if smuggling and bootlegging were declining. Moreover, the steady rise in liquor seizures has been accompanied by a similar rise in convictions for drunkenness.

We believe that the facts warrant one sound conclusion: The illegal liquor traffic is unquestionably greater than the legal.

Crime and the Dry Law

Statistics published by the Finnish Ministry of Justice show that under Prohibition the total number of convictions for crimes has increased from 37,104 in 1919 to 126,860 in 1927, or from 111.3 per 10,000 population to 353.5. (See Table X, page 29.)

There are wide differences of opinion in Finland, as in other countries, in respect to the degree in which liquor directly or indirectly breeds crime. Regardless of that moot question, the statistical evidence shows conclusively, in our opinion, that underlying causes of crime, such as economic and social conditions, have not been corrected by the total abstinence law. In fact, a study of the classifications in Table X, indicates that the theoretical suppression of liquor has merely been attended by heavily increased drunkenness and a springing up of thousands of Prohibition violations; otherwise the crime situation, as reflected in the convictions record, has shown little change either for better or for worse.

Of some 89,500 cases, representing the total increase in the number of convictions for 1927, as compared with 1919, offenses involving liquor account for a large part, if not the whole. Besides an increase of 17,000 Prohibition cases, the convictions for crimes against the State or society rose by more than 74,000 to a total of 84,241, of which more than 78,000 were for intoxication.

"Crimes against the person," convictions for which nearly doubled in 1919-1927, include a

dozen offenses ranging from murder and infanticide to fights and criminal assaults. More than half of the convictions in this category were for the less serious types of offense, but there was a considerable increase in murder and manslaughter. These crimes ran well below 200 in the years before 1917, when they jumped to 282. The total of 1,889 for 1918 was abnormal owing to the Civil War, and presumably conditions had not yet become quite stable in the first year of Prohibition, 1919, when the score was 416. The number dropped to 275 in 1920, again to 239 in 1921, and still further to 227 in 1922. There was a sharp rise to 289 in 1923, and since that time the total has remained above 300, with these figures for 1924-1928, inclusive: 316, 357, 343, 335, 336.

Crimes against property have declined sharply from 8,182 in 1919 to 5,717 in 1920 and 4,963 in 1921, since which they have remained below 4,000, but the miscellaneous offenses listed as "Other Crimes" have shown offsetting increases, for since the original drop from 9,459 in 1919 to 3,395 in 1920 there has been an almost steady rise, culminating in a total of 10,125 for 1927.

Four Revisions of the Dry Law

Finland's efforts to enforce Prohibition through a series of changes designed to put new "teeth" in the law, and to plug leaks in the liquor dam, have roughly paralleled the experience of the United States in that respect. Alterations in the law, always in the direction of greater severity, have been made no fewer than four times, viz., in 1919, 1922, 1926 and 1928. The enforcement machinery also has undergone reconstruction from time to time. Whatever may or may not have been accomplished, the situation remains one in which Prohibitionists still contend, as do their brethren in America, that the reason the law does not work is that there is laxity in enforcement.

The law was passed in 1917, but before it went into effect in 1919, the country suffered not only adverse effects from the World War but a five-month Civil War in the year 1918, when Communists were driven out. Changes made in 1919 were partly due to currency inflation, which made the amounts of fines, as previously fixed, insufficient as deterrents. For illegal manufacture, the original fine of 100 marks was increased to 500 to 10,000, and an alternative jail sentence up to one year was added. The original penalty for second offenders—a minimum of three months in

jail—was changed by adding an alternative fine of 1,000 to 10,000 marks.

For illegal sale or attempted sale, the penalty of 100 marks was increased to 500-10,000, with an alternative minimum jail sentence of three months. Second offenders' minimum jail sentence of two months was increased to three, but they were permitted, alternatively, to pay a fine of 1,000-10,000 marks. For possession of stills, the fine of 100 marks was raised to 100-5,000, while second offenders, previously fined 500 marks were assessed from 500-5,000, with an alternative jail term of three months to two years. The fine of 50-500 marks for illegal sales by drug stores was raised to 200-5,000, and loss of license was added for a second offense.

"Day Fines" Introduced

The changes of 1919 failed of their purpose, and by 1922 difficulties of enforcement led to the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee to investigate the situation. The Committee's findings became the basis of a complete revision of the law, which produced the measure now in force, although certain alterations have since been made. The "day fine" was introduced. A "day fine" represents a computation based on the defendant's average daily wage, his prosperity, his domestic obligations, and other factors in his ability to pay. For illegal manufacture, the fine of 500-10,000 marks became 100 day fines, and the alternative jail sentence was changed from a maximum of one year to a minimum of three months. The fine for illegal import, which had stood at 100 marks since 1917, was changed to 100 day fines, and the alternative jail sentence from a minimum of two months and maximum of two years to a minimum of three months with no maximum. Illegal sale or attempted sale was made punishable by 75 day fines, instead of 500-10,000 marks and an alternative minimum jail term of three months. Second offenders, formerly liable to a fine of 1,000-10,000 marks, were assessed 150 day fines, and the alternative minimum jail sentence was increased from three months to four.

The penalty for illicit stills was changed from 100-5,000 marks to 50 day fines; second offense, from 500-5,000 marks to 100 day fines, with alternative jail term of three months, minimum, instead of three months to two years. The penalty for illegal storage or transport since 1917 had been a minimum fine of 100 marks for a first offense, and for a second a fine of 200 marks, "or jail." This was changed as follows: First offense, 150 day fines, or four months in jail.

One of the chief alterations of the law in 1922 had to do with illegal use of a doctor's right to prescribe alcoholic beverages, for which no punishment had been provided theretofore. The penalty was fixed at a minimum of 75 day fines, first offense, and for a second offense, a minimum of 150 day fines, or a minimum jail term of four months. Illegal sales by drug stores were made punishable by 25 to 75 day fines, instead of 200-5,000 marks. Second offenders, who had been liable to loss of license, were assessed a minimum of 150 day fines, or a minimum imprisonment of four months, with an additional loss of license for at least three years. A revision of the law in 1928 made the minimum penalty for a first offense of this kind 75 day fines.

Holding the Buyer Guilty

Finland's attempt to make the buyer equally guilty with the seller (or giver) ended in 1928 after a six-year trial. The law of 1922 provided that if the "intoxicants consumed in a cafe, restaurant, [etc.] have been brought by a guest, all guilty parties shall be fined not less than 25 day fines for the first offense and not less than 50 day fines for the second." Also, any person who consumed alcoholic beverages in such places, irrespective of how and where the liquor had been obtained, was liable to a minimum of 25 day fines. It was found that these provisions increased the difficulty of getting witnesses in liquor cases, and the penalties were dropped in 1928. Changes in the revision of 1919, which were designed to punish an owner or manager permitting sales on the premises, have been retained.

Under the Finnish Prohibition law, in its various phases, a great majority of the convicted violators have been fined and not sent to jail. The largest proportion of jail sentences in any year up to 1927 was six per cent. in 1919. The percentages of jail terms for the years 1920 to 1927, inclusive, have been: 2.9, 2.1, 2.0, 1.9, 1.6, 2.4, 3.0 and 3.2.

Changes in Enforcement

Changes in enforcement machinery have kept pace with revisions of the law. Under the original law (1917) administration was vested in the Temperance Bureau of the Department for Social Affairs. The Bureau and the Department were reorganized before Prohibition went into effect. About three weeks before the law became operative, five separate enactments were issued. The first centred general supervision of Prohibition in the Temperance Department of the Ministry for Social Affairs. Appointment of persons to control denatured alcohol was authorized. The Department was authorized to nominate deputy sheriffs, if necessary for enforcement, and to select councillors to make inspection trips and advise police and local Temperance Boards. Cities and non-urban communities were empowered to appoint Temperance Boards and keep an eye on enforcement. Members of Temperance Boards had to be "known as temperance enthusiasts and reputable citizens." They could appoint supervisors as assistants. If salaried, they were to be paid by the city or the county government.

In 1921, the Temperance Department was relieved of the duty of controlling State manufacture of alcohol, and a committee of five persons, including the Director of the Department, was appointed for that purpose. In 1923, the position and the functions of the Department were stated anew. It now takes the initiative in preparing legislation and other proposals to promote temperance, advises Temperance Boards and their supervisors, supports the temperance work of private individuals or voluntary organizations, watches over enforcement, and handles permits for sales of alcohol.

Thus, the Temperance Department is charged with supervision of enforcement, although it has only remote connection with those actually trying to enforce the law.

As to Search and Seizure

Two changes affecting local Temperance Boards and supervisors have been made since 1919. In 1922, stricter qualifications for the personnel were set up. Originally, rights of search and seizure had been given the Boards and their supervisors, but in 1922 persons authorized by provincial governors to perform these acts were designated as Temperance Police. Whenever reasonable grounds existed for believing that the law was violated, they could "search in person or assist the police in making the search." The Boards and the Temperance Police were authorized to call on the regular police for help as needed.

Another revision of the law, in 1928, provided that right of search could be granted by the provincial governors for two-year periods only, and detailed regulations were made with a view toward more effective cooperation between the regular police on the one hand and the Prohibition officers on the other.

Similar steps for cooperation between the regular police and the Customs service were taken under an enactment of 1927 affecting such activities as apprehension of smugglers, and search for and seizure of contraband liquor. Furthermore, certain groups of State railway employes—station masters, superintendents and conductors—have the right to make searches in stations and freight depots, or on trains.

Still other enactments pertain to fast motor boats and to the use of force in taking law-breakers. No person may acquire a motor boat with a speed exceeding twelve knots, except with permission of the provincial governor, and such craft may be run only by registered engineers whom the authorities have approved. The use of force is hedged in by stringent regulations.

Restricted Use of Firearms

Firearms may be employed in capturing law-breakers only if the suspected person "uses a fast motor-driven conveyance and no danger exists that harm may result to innocent parties and even under these circumstances only if (a) two competent witnesses are present; (b) if the person making the capture has made himself known by shouting or some other effective means, has told the suspect to stop and, having become convinced that the fugitive has heard the shout and understood its meaning; and if furthermore he has shot at least twice in the air by way of warning." Having observed these precautions, the officer may shoot down the smuggler; but while taking aim he must heed one final injunction: "When firearms are used, the aim must be such as not to cause unnecessary suffering."

The privilege of using firearms is reserved for "officers on Customs duty," and these regulations are in force only within five kilometres of the boundary.

Results of an Official Inquiry

The Finnish government in 1922 appointed an Alcohol Committee to supervise an inquiry into Prohibition. The work was done by government departments, and the results were published in four volumes in 1925, to which was added in 1926 a fifth containing the report of the Committee. The periods covered by different parts of that survey are not identical, and the returns do not necessarily picture conditions which prevail today; but we give here a summary of the

Alcohol Committee's conclusions in the belief that they shed light on the broad question of Prohibition in Finland.

In reference to drinking during Prohibition, the Committee found that "it is clear that the use of intoxicants in our country is appreciably greater than during the World War in spite of the Prohibition laws. Whether the consumption of alcohol is greater than before 1914 cannot be ascertained. It is probable, however . . . that it is not greater, especially if we take into account the increase in population."

Drunkenness seemed to have increased in the rural parts of the country, according to the report, and the younger generation was more addicted to liquor than before Prohibition. The relation between strong drink and crime was established by an ascertainable connection between liquor and crimes of violence, and it was noted that persons addicted to intoxicants figured more prominently in lawlessness than did others. It was also found that alcoholism seemed to be on the increase.

While it was held to be impossible to make any accurate estimate of the economic consequences of Prohibition, it was suggested that "considerable amounts are undoubtedly spent on intoxicants." Because the situation "in recent years, viz., prior to 1926, has been unquestionably worse than in 1919, when the law went into effect, it would appear that Prohibition as such has not directly contributed toward increasing sobriety. The good effects of Prohibition have thus been felt only indirectly, and one might hold that conditions would have been even worse without Prohibition."

Official Laxity Found

On the other hand, the report explained, the temperance situation could not be attributed to Prohibition alone, "for factors quite independent of the law have undoubtedly contributed to its darker aspects." Among these factors were an abnormal spirit of general lawlessness incidental to the post-war period, the rapid increase in use of automobiles, and inadequate enforcement of the law, laxity, incompetence and outright unwillingness among the authorities having been not uncommon. The Committee stated also that educational temperance work had declined during the years following adoption of Prohibition and that the conditions described were partly due to the collapse of this persuasive influence. In a summing up, the report stated:

> Although it must be admitted that the enforcement of the law disclosed great defects

and difficulties, the Committee feels . . . that it would be wholly precipitate to maintain that more satisfactory enforcement is impossible. The experiences with enforcement to date serve only to show the enormous difficulties of upholding the law under the conditions which have prevailed since Prohibition went into effect.

The Alcohol Committee was predominantly dry in sentiment. Two of the seven members were among the most prominent Prohibitionists in Finland. Not all of the seven were satisfied with the final conclusions, and three dissenting opinions were presented.

Some Dissenting Opinions

The first of these stated: "Not only has Prohibition failed in its main purpose, which is the improvement of the temperance situation, but it has actually produced new difficulties." Considerable economic losses to the State, according to this opinion, were the consequence of a system which made possible the use of intoxicants without taxation.

The second dissenting opinion took exception to the statement that it was too early to decide whether Prohibition was a curse or a blessing, held that it effects proved clearly that it produced only deplorable results, and continued: "The attempt to increase sobriety by means of a law which makes for more objectionable habits of drinking and destroys public morality is obviously futile. Prohibition is no longer a child of yesterday. Its results can be perceived by all who have eyes to see. These results are such that the only possible conclusion is: the sooner we get rid of Prohibition, the better."

The third opinion held that the Committee had "succeeded in the main in its huge task," but took issue with interpretations of the material gathered. It protested particularly against a conclusion that drinking among younger people was increasing, and contended that that point had not been proved. Also it was asserted that the Committee had not succeeded in ascertaining the degree in which the law was enforced, for it had failed to consult individuals and organizations known to be friends of enforcement.

Anti-Smuggling Treaties

Finnish "Drys" agree generally that the greatest obstacle in the way of successful Prohibition

enforcement is smuggling. In January, 1923, the Prohibition League, an unofficial organization, submitted to the government a memorial which stated that smuggling had grown rapidly in Norway, Sweden and Finland, and recommended that effective cooperation among them be arranged, to stop the practice.

It was Norway, however, which took the lead in that direction. A conference called by the Norwegian government was held in Oslo in June, 1923.*

Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Germany and Norway were represented by delegates. The delegates agreed to submit to their respective governments for adoption a plan whereby liquor exports would be permitted, in ships of less than 100 tons burden, only if the manifests showed no illicit trade was intended. The shipper would be obliged, moreover, to present to authorities at the port of clearance, within a reasonable time, a declaration to prove his cargo had been delivered to the consignee named in the manifest. Uniform ship manifests for the several countries were recommended.

Before this proposed agreement could be put into effect, Finland appointed a committee to draft an anti-smuggling treaty on a broader basis. In the result, a compact was signed at Helsingfors in August, 1925, by delegates, representing Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Germany, Poland, Lithuania, Esthonia, Latvia, Russia and the Free City of Danzig. The agreement stipulated—

1. "Alcoholic beverages" meant spirits of more than 18 per cent alcoholic content and did not include beers or wines.
2. Vessels of less than 100 tons, net, were prohibited from exporting liquors, unless mechanically propelled craft in regular traffic and on definite routes.
3. Exports in vessels of less than 500 tons were permitted only when authorized by officials of the country of origin.
4. The captain of the ship had to present a written declaration vouching for the legality of the shipment and for its future delivery to the consignee.
5. The ship's master was required to keep a record of all shipments, attested by officials at ports of clearance and destination.

Twelve-Mile Limit Agreed On

A twelve-mile limit was agreed on, in respect

* Norway at the time was trying the "noble experiment," as Prohibition was not discarded in that country until 1927.

to pursuit and search of vessels, under the following terms:

> The Contracting Parties undertake to raise no objection to the application by any of them of its laws, within a zone extending to twelve nautical miles from the coast or from the exterior limit of the archipelagoes, to ships which are obviously engaged in contraband traffic. If a vessel suspected of engaging in contraband traffic is discovered in the enlarged zone . . . and escapes . . . the authorities of the country exercising control over the zone in question may pursue the vessel beyond into the open sea and exercise the same rights in respect of it as if it had been seized within the zone.

By the time this treaty passed through the final stages, a Protocol and an Additional Agreement had been attached. The German delegation, desiring that the German wine trade should not suffer, stipulated that the agreement should apply only to spirits with an alcoholic content of 22 per cent or more. Russia also accepted on that condition. Germany, Poland and Russia stated further that in subscribing to the extended right of pursuit they were not ipso facto recognizing such a right. Russia also demanded an agreement, which was consummated, with Finland and Esthonia regarding certain custom zones in the Gulf of Finland.

The last ratification of this treaty, in August, 1929, found the smugglers unwilling to abandon their lucrative trade. The treaty put them to the inconvenience of painting new names on their vessels and buying, or otherwise acquiring, new flags. Consequently, craft manned by Germans or Esthonians, as of old, have since been appearing in the Baltic under a variety of flags, Greek, Czechoslovakian, Persian, Turkish, Brazilian, attesting registry in countries which are not parties to the anti-smuggling convention.

Although the treaty represented four years of negotiation among eleven signatory parties, the smugglers executed their counter-move virtually overnight.

Appeal to the League of Nations

In the Autumn of 1925, when the Helsingfors Convention had just been drafted, the Finnish Prohibition League conceived the idea of dragging the League of Nations into the total abstinence crusade. A deliberate attempt was made to foist upon that international conclave an organization of dry propagandists. The Prohibition League requested the Finnish government to take energetic

measures toward arranging a general, international agreement in reference to smuggling and recommended that the question be laid before the Council of the League of Nations.

The government, acceding to the "Drys'" wishes, enlisted the support of Sweden and Poland for the proposal which was presented to the Assembly of the League of Nations in September, 1926. The three countries asked "that the Assembly should decide to include in the programme of the work of the League of Nations the question of alcoholism and should ask the Council to take measures to this effect." The proposal was placed on the agenda for the next ordinary session of the Assembly. Before further action was taken, Denmark, Belgium and Czechoslovakia concurred in the plan, which was referred to the Committee on Technical Organization, in September, 1927.

When the proposal came up for debate on September 16, M. Voionmaa, a veteran Prohibitionist, appeared as Finland's spokesman. He recommended the creation of an Advisory Committee on Alcoholism, with sufficient authority to lay proposals before the Council and the Assembly. Voionmaa had the hardihood to outline a scheme whereby the International Bureau Against Alcoholism should be placed under the auspices of the League of Nations, and the Advisory Committee on Alcoholism should ask that Bureau to make investigations. Had that stratagem succeeded, the League of Nations would have become entangled with Prohibition propagandists.

The proposal was promptly squelched, being opposed by M. Loucheur, the French delegate, who was supported by Austrian, Italian, Portuguese and Australian colleagues. The Finnish spokesman announced in a statement:

> After an exhaustive debate, which has shown the complex nature of the problem, and considering the difficulties of principle and procedure which have been raised, the signatory delegations, while maintaining the principle of their motion, have decided to withdraw it provisionally, while reserving the right to submit it in another form.

Amendment of the Scheme

A week later, the proposal was revived in amended form, calling for the appointment of a Committee of Experts on Alcoholism, for "the study of the aspects of the question of alcoholism which come within the competence" of the League, and "which might be made the subject of scientific or practical work." The plan, as

finally adopted, in September, 1928, provided for gathering of information on abuse of alcohol, with especial reference to deleterious effects of the bad quality of the alcohol consumed; also, inquiries into smuggling in general, and smuggling of alcohol in particular. Wine, beer and cider were excluded from the field of investigation. The Health Committee and the Economic Committee, respectively, were authorized to carry out the two branches of the work.

What recommendations, if any, these committees will submit cannot now be foreseen, but they will not be dependent on "investigations" by the International Bureau Against Alcoholism.

Protests of Prominent Finns

In the closing months of 1929, Prohibition in Finland suffered several severe jolts through candid statements by public men who had theretofore kept their own counsel. We have found that the Finnish situation in that respect closely parallels that in the United States. The Prohibitionists in both countries make the same excuses for the failure of their experiment and offer the same promises of better things to come; in both countries, a conviction has been steadily gaining ground among the people that absolute Prohibition laws are unsound and unworkable, and in both countries the militant "Drys" oppose a national referendum.

The first thunderclap of the gathering storm in Finland occurred in October, 1929, when General Bruno Jalander issued a long statement to the press, which was published in the *Helsinski News* (*Helsingin Sanomat*) on October 27, 1929. General Jalander was Governor of the province of Uusimaa, in which the capital Helsingfors is situated. He said that Prohibition restricted personal liberty to such a degree as to provoke a deliberate desire to break the law. Non-observance had become so common that nobody had need to feel ashamed of it. The constantly growing illicit traffic in intoxicants proved a general public disregard for the law. The public attitude, according to the Governor, made it frequently impossible to procure witnesses in liquor prosecutions. General lawlessness fed upon the demoralization attributable to Prohibition, he asserted, and the jails were filled to overflowing. In those circumstances, it was futile to blame the authorities for lax enforcement.

In spite of all the corruption caused by the law, General Jalander continued, there were still

many "dreamers who obstinately cling to it and refuse to admit honestly that the experiment has failed. The sooner we proceed to change the law in a sensible manner, the sooner shall we be able to improve the uncomfortable situation into which this law has brought us."

Official Reproof for a Governor

The government promptly issued in reply a circular disapproving the Governor's manner of presenting his views and, after calling for an explanation from him, reproved him with a reminder of his official duty in connection with upholding of the law.

The Jalander incident had scarcely been closed when, on November 6, the Governor of the Inland province of Kuopio, Mr. Gustaf Ignatius, submitted a report* to the Ministry of the Interior which read in part:

> Although the Kuopio province is in a more favorable position than the coastal provinces, in that the transportation of intoxicants is somewhat more difficult, drunkenness and violations of the Prohibition enactment are growing. . . . In my opinion, our experience has demonstrated that our present Prohibition law is not the means whereby national temperance can be promoted. We should abandon it, for our continued, ineffectual efforts to enforce it undermine the authority of law and decrease the respect for the government of the country. . . . We should try to find a law supported by the people and enforceable by the authorities.

These opinions, which were not attributable to anti-Prohibition prejudice, were supported in part by the Prime Minister of Finland, Mr. K. Kallio. Both his known personal convictions and his political affiliation with the Agrarian party stamped Mr. Kallio as a Prohibitionist. Speaking at a meeting on November 3, 1929, for the opening of the Annual Temperance Week, he said, according to the *Helsinski News* (*Helsingin Sanomat*) of the following day:

> It is a regrettable fact that the enforcement of the law has met with greater difficulties than we anticipated at the time we took the decisive step. . . . Ten years' experience compels us to confess that we failed to estimate correctly the attitude of our people. We were accustomed to take respect for the laws for granted and believed that

* Published in the Helsinski News (Helsingin Sanomat), November 11, 1929.

no serious opposition to an enactment unanimously passed needed to be expected. Now we know that the enforcement of the law requires something more than legislative paragraphs and administrative decrees.

Premier Kallio referred to those who contended there had been no real effort to make the law effective, and continued:

> Such critics forget that those who would make it a success are opposed by a united front on which consumers of strong drink, speculators, and those who oppose Prohibition on principle stand shoulder to shoulder. They are surrounded by a great mass of individuals who are indifferent to smugglers and give other crimes a chance to flourish. . . . This passive attitude is dangerous to society, for it encourages the lawless, because they discover that their conception of the obligations of citizenship is tolerated.

The Premier thought it had not been proved that the people's basic ideas as to how national sobriety should be achieved had undergone a change; but he urged that "the nation must give unstinted support to the efforts of the authorities everywhere," and that "we must create a 'Prohibition will' among the people."

A Dry Leader's Confession

Even the views of the Prime Minister were eclipsed by a statement published on November 5, 1929, by Dr. Paavo Virkkunen, Speaker of the Finnish Parliament. Dr. Virkkunen is not only an eminent clergyman but a staunch Prohibitionist. He stated in *New Finland* (*Uusi Suomi*), the chief newspaper of his (Union) party:

> We have arrived at a turning point, and it would mean marked levity to close one's eyes to the actual conditions which stare us threateningly in the face every day, and to fail to follow to their conclusions the analyses which will point the way out of the difficulties which confront us. According to my opinion, the first thing that must be done . . . is to ascertain the opinion of the majority of the people in regard to Prohibition. Whatever procedure is chosen to improve the existing deplorable situation, this must be the starting point. . . .
>
> I have been opposed in the past to the proposition [that a popular referendum should be resorted to] but the seriousness of the present situation compels me to abandon . . . my earlier doubts and brings me to support the holding of a national vote. . . . I am unable to discover any other way out of the blind alley where we find ourselves.

Dr. Virkkunen explained that if a majority of the nation were found to believe "that one must climb up the tree from the ground and not by way of the top," certain modifications of the law would be required; if a majority were to vote for retention of the law without change, the government would be in a position to use more stringent and more resolute enforcement measures. He concluded:

> From whatever viewpoint I look at the question, I come to the same conclusion: The fate of the Prohibition law must be determined by a national referendum at the earliest possible date.

"Wronging" the Voter

The suggestion of a national referendum apparently pained the militant Prohibitionists in Finland as acutely as similar proposals have pained their brethren in America. K. K. Aro, head of the Temperance Bureau, explained that there were "many voters who are wholly unable to understand the importance of the Prohibition question and consequently have no opinion in the matter; it would be therefore an outright wrong to make them decide a question which they cannot comprehend."

N. Liakka, formerly head of the Temperance Bureau, was not unduly exercised over the possibility of wronging the voters, so far as our record states, but he expressed the opinion that a national referendum would only result in "befuddling moral concepts and the sense of right and justice."

TABLE I

LIQUOR CONSUMPTION IN FINLAND BEFORE PROHIBITION

(In Litres of 100 Per Cent Alcohol)

Year	Spirits	Per Capita	Wines	Per Capita	Malt Beverages	Per Capita	Total	Per Capita
1871–1875	4,904,700	2.66	128,400	.07	207,100	.11	5,240,400	2.84
1876–1880	4,995,500	2.52	142,400	.07	314,400	.16	5,452,400	2.75
1881–1885	5,561,200	2.61	159,200	.08	562,900	.26	6,283,500	2.95
1886–1890	3,830,700	1.67	164,500	.07	738,100	.32	4,733,500	2.06
1891–1895	3,364,000	1.38	189,800	.08	919,500	.37	4,473,300	1.83
1896–1900	4,142,400	1.58	223,200	.09	1,237,500	.47	5,603,300	2.14
1901–1905	3,605,500	1.28	164,500	.06	1,065,200	.38	4,835,400	1.72
1906–1910	3,415,100	1.14	232,600	.08	1,096,200	.36	4,744,000	1.58
1911–1913	2,998,600	.94	428,400	.14	1,022,800	.32	4,450,000	1.40
1914–1918	797,400	.24	99,800	.03	582,200	.18	1,479,500	0.45

NOTE—One U. S. gallon equals approximately three and three-quarters (3.78533) litres.

TABLE II

TOTAL STATE ALCOHOL CORPORATION SALES, 1919-1927

(In Litres of 100 Per Cent)

Year	Apothecaries	Drug Stores	Industrial Concerns	Hospitals	Scientific Establishments	Churches	Total	Per Capita
1919	231,500	62,000	146,800	5,500*	.....	100	445,900	.13
1920	575,600	70,600	186,600	7,000	2,700	3,300	845,800	.25
1921	753,200	62,600	208,600	7,200	2,700	2,800	1,037,100	.30
1922	1,150,900	154,200	240,400	8,500	3,600	2,900	1,560,500	.45
1923	871,800	182,600	234,400	10,100	4,600	2,600	1,306,100	.38
1924	1,053,500	209,400	310,300	13,000	4,200	2,900	1,593,300	.46
1925	1,165,100	240,700	224,900	14,100	3,500	2,900	1,651,200	.47
1926	3,353,700	617,000	542,000	32,300	12,800	18,000	4,575,800	1.26
1927	3,582,600	751,500	602,400	37,600	10,300	17,200	5,001,600	1.39

* Includes sales for scientific purposes.

NOTE—One U. S. gallon equals approximately three and three-quarters (3.78533) litres.

TABLE III
CONVICTIONS FOR DRUNKENNESS, 1900-1918
(From Alkoholikomitea)

Year	In Cities	In Rural Communities	Total
1900	8,470	610	9,080
1901	7,060	700	7,760
1902	6,570	570	7,140
1903	8,190	510	8,700
1904	7,000	340	7,340
1905	4,640	500	5,140
1906	6,840	390	7,230
1907	14,000	580	14,580
1908	15,090	760	15,850
1909	12,510	1,040	13,550
1910	11,200	1,010	12,210
1911	12,440	1,170	13,610
1912	14,710	1,060	15,770
1913	15,080	850	15,930
1914	8,200	1,100	9,300
1915	1,100	350	2,197*
1916	28	77	3,094**
1917	1,590	130	1,720
1918	430	40	470

* Includes 747 convictions by provincial governors.
** Includes 2,989 convictions by provincial governors.

TABLE IV
CONVICTIONS FOR DRUNKENNESS, 1910–1927

Year	City	Rural	Total	Rate per 10,000 Population
1910	11,200	1,020	12,220	39.22
1911	12,450	1,170	13,620	43.17
1912	14,710	1,060	15,770	49.35
1913	15,080	850	15,930	49.30
1919	4,898	491	5,389	16.17
1920	18,881	2,303	21,184	62.96
1921	25,543	5,188	30,731	90.32
1922	26,024	9,892	35,916	104.55
1923	35,161	14,955	50,116	144.45
1924	40,284	16,877	57,161	163.55
1925	43,418	20,949	64,367	182.53
1926	42,408	22,608	65,016	182.69
1927	49,676	28,576	78,252	218.09

NOTE—There is a slight discrepancy in the totals for 1910 and 1911 in this table and in Table III. Both tables are taken from official sources and the apparent conflict is insignificant.

TABLE V
ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS, 1922–1928

Year	City	Rural	Total
1922	30,460	12,340	42,800
1923	40,570	15,840	56,410
1924	45,250	18,160	63,410
1925	47,310	22,990	70,300
1926	48,860	24,960	73,820
1927	54,800	32,380	87,180
1928	63,260	37,780	101,040

TABLE VI
ALCOHOLIC PATIENTS IN PSYCHOPATHIC INSTITUTIONS
1909–1928

Year	No. of Institutions	Total No. of Patients	No. of Alcoholics	Percent. of Alcoholics
1909	2	400	34	8.5
1910	2	429	33	7.7
1911	2	448	35	7.8
1912	2	502	45	9.0
1913	4	862	77	8.0
1914	4	736	61	8.3
1915	3	664	27	4.1
1916	3	660	30	4.5
1917	4	740	28	3.8
1918	3	1,089	16	1.5
1919*	3	548	13	2.4
1920	4	741	48	6.5
1921	4	680	63	9.3
1922	5	1,090	134	12.3
1923	5	1,060	167	15.8
1924	5	1,147	242	21.1
1925	5	1,151	280	24.5
1926	5	1,119	223	20.8
1927	5	1,186	304	25.6
1928	5	1,310	345	26.3

* Prohibition began.

TABLE VII

CONVICTIONS FOR PROHIBITION VIOLATIONS
1919–1927

Year	City	Rural	Total
1919	917	4,363	5,280
1920	3,570	6,993	10,563
1921	4,972	6,048	11,020
1922	5,800	6,993	12,793
1923	8,086	9,254	17,340
1924	8,517	9,192	17,709
1925	8,961	10,852	19,813
1926	8,545	10,101	18,646
1927	10,618	11,756	22,374

TABLE VIII*

CONVICTIONS FOR PROHIBITION VIOLATIONS
1919–1927

Year	Illegal Manufacture	Illegal Import	Illegal Sale	Illegal Possession or Transportation
1919	1,695	119	445	697
1920	3,899	537	2,073	4,078
1921	2,594	650	2,269	6,107
1922	2,504	549	2,448	7,230
1923	2,014	673	2,875	11,579
1924	886	491	2,739	13,381
1925	701	576	3,563	14,669
1926	805	737	3,478	13,205
1927	651	1,009	3,884	16,258

* There are variations in the totals shown in Tables VII and VIII, owing to the fact that one set of figures has been compiled from the *Social Review*, a monthly publication of the Ministry for Social Affairs, and the other from *Crime*, an annual report of the Department of Justice, to which the courts submit returns. Both sources are official. The discrepancies are evidently due to errors in compilation, but they are unimportant numerically.

TABLE IX

TOTAL SEIZURES OF INTOXICANTS, 1919-1928
(In Litres)

Year	Confiscations by the Customs	Confiscations by the Police	Total
1919	8,440	.....	8,440
1920	110,270	.....	110,270
1921	72,900	.....	72,900
1922	225,460	70,610	296,070
1923	503,800	227,000	730,800
1924	521,080	323,940	845,020
1925	557,010	337,010	894,020
1926	664,640	378,460	1,043,100
1927	637,360	437,930	1,075,290
1928	985,990	200,000	1,185,990

TABLE X

CONVICTIONS FOR CRIMES, 1919-1927

Year	Against the State or Society	Against the Person	Against Property	Prohibition Cases	Other Crimes	Convictions by Courts Martial (Various Crimes)	Total	Per 10,000 Population
1919	9,881	1,382	8,182	5,280	9,459	2,920	37,104	111.3
1920	26,848	1,682	5,717	10,561	3,395	2,157	50,360	149.7
1921	36,299	1,885	4,963	11,018	3,863	1,636	59,664	175.4
1922	40,977	1,818	3,894	12,793	3,583	1,682	64,747	188.5
1923	54,256	1,856	3,386	17,338	4,112	1,814	82,947	239.1
1924	61,520	1,994	3,190	17,709	4,618	2,278	91,648	262.2
1925	68,825	2,346	3,626	18,808	5,376	3,015	103,151	292.5
1926	70,099	2,356	3,875	18,645	6,805	2,853	104,797	294.5
1927	84,241	2,629	3,822	22,371	10,125	2,895	126,860	353.5

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States, as established by the Fathers, delegated to the Federal Government only such powers as in their very nature should be Federal and not State, and under that distribution of powers our country enjoyed progress and stability for a hundred and thirty years; and

Whereas, the Eighteenth Amendment is misplaced in the Federal Constitution in violation of the fundamental American right of local self-government in local affairs, and in surrender to the Federal authorities of police duties over the habits and the conduct of individuals which belong of right to the States; and

Whereas, National Prohibition under this Amendment has been the source of intolerable wrongs, having undermined our Federal system of government, robbed our citizens of Constitutional rights, fostered excessive drinking of strong intoxicants, bred corruption and hypocrisy, caused ruthless killings of men, women and children, sown disrespect for law and order, and flooded our country with untaxed and illicit liquor; therefore be it

Resolved, that the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment demands redress of these wrongs through restoration to the several States of the right of their peoples to enact such liquor laws as they may respectively choose, the abolition of the old-time saloon having paved the way for sound and enlightened legislation by them for the control, or, if they wish, for the prohibition of the liquor trade, provided that such legislation shall not conflict with the duty of the Federal Government to protect each State against violation of its laws by citizens of other states; and be it therefore further

Resolved, that the Eighteenth Amendment must be Repealed.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE
ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE
PROHIBITION AMENDMENT

June 1, 1930

W. H. STAYTON, Chairman
Washington

MATHER A. ABBOTT, Head Master of the Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, New Jersey.
GEORGE ADE, Author, Hazelden Farm, Brook, Indiana.
R. L. AGASSIZ, Chairman of the Board, Calumet and Hecla Consolidated Copper Co., 12 Ashburton Place, Boston, Massachusetts.
FREDERICK H. ALLEN, International Lawyer, practising in New York and Europe; attached to Commission to negotiate peace in Paris in 1919, 2 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
FREDERIC WINTHROP ALLEN, Partner, Lee Higginson and Co., bankers, 37 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
JOHANNES ANDERSEN, Merchant, Importer and Manufacturer of Pulp and Paper, 21 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
H. M. ATKINSON, Financier, Electric & Gas Building, Atlanta, Georgia.
GENERAL W. W. ATTERBURY, Broad Street Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

JOHN E. BACON, M.D., Chief Surgeon, Miami Inspiration Hospital, Miami, Arizona.
DR. THOMAS BARBOUR, Professor of Zoology and Director of Harvard University Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
JOHN BARNES, Amsterdam, New York.
JAMES S. BARRON, Lawyer, State Senator, Virginia; Norfolk, Virginia.
G. D'ANDELOT BELIN, President, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company of Pennsylvania; Scranton, Pennsylvania.
S. R. BERTRON, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
W. G. BESLER, Chairman of the Board, The Central R. R. Co. of New Jersey, 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.
HARRY S. BLACK, Chairman of the Board, U. S. Realty and Improvement Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
JAMES G. BLAINE, President, Fidelity Trust Company of New York, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
PIERCE BLEWETT, Farmer, Jamestown, North Dakota.
G. ALDER BLUMER, M.D., 196 Blackstone Boulevard, Providence, Rhode Island.
HARLOW BROOKS, M.D., Consulting Physician, 47 West Ninth Street, New York, N. Y.
FRANK C. BROPHY, Chairman, Arizona Committee of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, 514 Heard Building, Phoenix, Arizona.
JAMES B. BROWN, President, National Bank of Kentucky, Louisville, Kentucky.
SAMUEL A. BROWN, M.D., 75 East 55th Street, New York, N. Y.
MATTHEW C. BRUSH, President, American International Corporation, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
WALTER H. BUCK, Union Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
J. LEWIS BUMGARDNER, Beckley, West Virginia.
STRUTHERS BURT, Author; Member American Institute Arts and Letters, President, Bar B. C. Ranch Co., Wyoming.
S. P. BUSH, Retired Industrialist, 20 South Third Street, Columbus, Ohio.

DONALD A. CALLAHAN, Lawyer, Wallace, Idaho.
J. DAWSON CALLERY, Banker, President Diamond National Bank, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
ROBERT K. CASSATT, Partner, Cassatt & Company, Bankers, Commercial Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
SAMUEL HARDEN CHURCH, President, Carnegie Institute, 4781 Wallingford Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
EMORY W. CLARK, Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Detroit, 8310 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Michigan.
H. A. CLARK, Manager, Calumet and Arizona Mining Company, Warren, Arizona.
HERBERT L. CLARK, Partner, E. W. Clark and Co., bankers Locust at 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
JULIAN CODMAN, Lawyer, 53 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
WALTER B. COFFEY, M.D., Head of the Hospital Service of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, San Francisco, California.
B. DAWSON COLEMAN, Banker, Lebanon, Pennsylvania.
WARREN COLEMAN, M.D., 59 East 54th Street, New York, N. Y.
JAMES FENIMORE COOPER, Attorney-at-Law, 35 State Street, Albany, New York.

W. R. C. Corson, Pres. & Treas., Hartford Steam Boiler, Inspection & Insurance Co., 127 Oxford Street, Hartford, Connecticut.
Frederic R. Coudert, Member of the New York Bar, 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
R. T. Crane, Jr., President, The Crane Co., 836 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Benedict Crowell, Chairman of the Board, Crowell & Little Construction Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Assistant Secretary of War during World War, 930 Hanna Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
Henry H. Curran, President, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, 21 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

Richard H. Dabney, Author, Professor of History, formerly Professor of Economics, University of Virginia, University, Virginia.
Charles Loomis Dana, M.D., 53 West 53rd Street, New York, N. Y.
Milton Dargan, Hurt Building, Atlanta, Georgia.
Benjamin S. Dean, Counselor-at-Law, Fenton Building, Jamestown, New York.
John B. Deaver, M.D., Surgeon; Professor of Surgery, University of Pennsylvania, 1830 De Lancey Place, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Henry W. de Forest, Lawyer; Chairman of the Executive Committee, Southern Pacific Co., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
William De Krafft, Baldwin Locomotive Works, Fidelity Philadelphia Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Lyman Delano, Executive Vice President, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Wilmington, North Carolina.
A. C. Deuel, President and General Manager, Niagara Falls Gazette, Niagara Falls, New York.
Colonel B. H. Dibblee, Vice President and Director, E. H. Rollins & Sons, Russ Building, San Francisco, California.
Joseph Dilworth, Dilworth, Porter & Company, South Side Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Henry W. Dooley, Chairman, Woodrow Wilson Foundation, San Juan, P. R.
F. J. Douglas, M.D., Surgeon, 285 Genesee Street, Utica, New York.
Walter Douglas, President, Phelps Dodge Corporation, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
Irénée du Pont, Chairman of the Finance Committee, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Delaware.
Lammot du Pont, President, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Delaware.
Pierre S. du Pont, Chairman of the Board, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Delaware.
Isaac W. Dyer, Lawyer; former United States Attorney for Maine, 85 Exchange Street, Portland, Maine.

Sterling E. Edmunds, Lawyer, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Missouri.
Sidney M. Ehrman, Lawyer, Nevada Bank Building, San Francisco, California.
William M. Elkins, Partner, Elkins, Morris and Co., bankers, 1233 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Caswell P. Ellis, Jr., Cotton Commission Merchant; dealer in stocks and bonds, 905 Hibernia Bank Building, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Nathaniel A. Elsberg, 141 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
William P. Eno, Highway Traffic Regulation Engineer, 1771 N Street, Washington, D. C.
Marion Epley, Physicist, The Eppley Research Laboratory, Beacon Rock, Newport, Rhode Island.
John Erskine, Professor, 49 East 52nd Street, New York, N. Y.
Milton H. Esberg, Mercantile Executive, 601 Third Street, San Francisco, California.

George R. Fearing, Member of the firm, Jackson & Curtis, Brokers, 19 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
Stanley Field, Director, Marshall Field & Co.; President, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois, 231 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Thomas W. Finucane, Capitalist, 183 East Main Street, Rochester, New York.
Frederick P. Fish, Lawyer; former President, American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 84 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
Fred J. Fisher, Vice President, General Motors Corporation, Cass and Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan.
George P. Fiske, Retired, Texas, care of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, 43 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
Mitchell D. Follansbee, Partner, Follansbee, Shorey & Schupp, 137 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Tod Ford, Pasadena, California.
Fabian Franklin, Journalist, Author and Mathematician, 417 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.

P. A. S. Franklin, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
George Harrison Frazier, 1016 Packard Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
William Frew, Banker, Union Trust Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Harold deWolf Fuller, Editor and Teacher, 32 Washington Place, New York, N. Y.

William Gammell, Partner, Brown & Ives, bankers, 50 S. Main Street, Providence, Rhode Island.
Irvin McD. Garfield, Member of firm, Warren, Garfield, Whiteside & Lamson, Lawyers, 30 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
Clarence H. Geist, President, The C. H. Geist Co., Packard Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Robert Glendinning, 15th and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
David M. Goodrich, Director, The B. F. Goodrich Co., 17 East 42nd Street, New York, N. Y.
Anson C. Goodyear, President, Great Southern Lumber Co. 1104 Marine Trust Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.

Arthur F. Hall, The Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., Fort Wayne, Indiana.
James C. Hamlen, President, J. H. Hamlen & Son, Inc., Lumber Manufacturers and Timber Land Owners, Portland, Maine.
Joseph R. Hamlen, Director for New England, Rudolph Guenther-Russell Law, Inc., Financial Advertising; President, Harvard Alumni Bulletin; Chairman, Harvard Fund Council, 111 Devonshire Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
Edward S. Harkness, Philanthropist; Director, New York Central Railroad and Southern Pacific Co., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. Roland Harriman, Vice President, W. A. Harriman & Co., bankers, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Charles Hayden, Partner, Hayden, Stone & Co., bankers, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
Augustine Healy, Firleigh Farms, Southern Pines, North Carolina.
Burt W. Henry, Partner, Henry and Cooper, Canal Bank Building, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Erskine Hewitt, Ringwood Manor, Passaic County, New Jersey.
H. L. Holden, Jr., Easton, Maryland.
Henry Hornblower, Banker, 60 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
Frank S. Howland, Athens, New York.
Elton Hoyt, II, Partner, Pickands, Mather & Co., Union Trust Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
Gerald Hughes, Lawyer; Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Denver; International Trust Bldg., Denver, Colorado.
Hugh Hume, Editor, The Spectator, Portland, Oregon.

William M. Ingraham, Lawyer; Former Assistant Secretary of War, Clapp Memorial Building, Portland, Maine.
James Irvine, Agriculturist, Crocker Building, San Francisco, California.
Joseph N. Ivey, Suite 1309 Hoge Building, Seattle, Washington.

Daniel C. Jackling, Industrialist and Engineer, Hobart Building, San Francisco, California.
Malcolm Jackson, Lawyer, retired, 30 Bradford Street, Charleston, West Virginia.
Arthur Curtiss James, Vice President, Phelps Dodge Corporation, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
Oliver G. Jennings, Fairfield, Connecticut.
Henry W. Jessup, Lawyer, The Bar Building, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
Eldridge R. Johnson, Philanthropist; former President, Victor Talking Machine Co., Camden, New Jersey.
Henry B. Joy, former President, Packard Motor Car Co., Penobscot Bldg., Detroit, Michigan.

Cornelius F. Kelley, President, Anaconda Copper Mining Co., Montana, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Colonel J. Miller Kenyon, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.
C. J. Keyser, Adrain Professor Emeritus of Mathematics in Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
F. M. Kirby, Vice President, Woolworth Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.
John H. Kirby, President, Kirby Lumber Co., Houston, Texas.
Arnold H. Knapp, M.D., Executive Surgeon, Herman Knapp Memorial Eye Hospital, 10 East 54th Street, New York, N. Y.
William S. Knudsen, Vice President, General Motors Corporation, 1501 Balmoral Drive, Detroit, Michigan.

FREDERICK J. KOSTER, Manufacturer, 433 California Street, San Francisco, California.

SAMUEL W. LAMBERT, M.D., Former Dean of College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; President, New York Academy of Medicine, 128 East 75th Street, New York, N. Y.

ARTHUR W. LAWRENCE, 4 Valley Road, Bronxville, New York.

ALEXANDER LINCOLN, Lawyer, former Assistant Attorney-General, Massachusetts, 53 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

HENRY F. LIPPITT, Chairman of the Board, Manville Jenckes Company, Providence, Rhode Island.

THOMAS B. LOCKWOOD, 512 Manufacturers & Traders Building, Buffalo, New York.

ARTHUR LYMAN, Trustee; President, Merrimack Manufacturing Company; Director, Old Colony Trust Company, 60 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

ARTHUR W. MACHEN, JR., Lawyer; Chairman, Maryland Committee of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, Calvert Building, Baltimore, Maryland.

NORMAN E. MACK, 1106 Rand Building, Buffalo, New York.

F. W. MACLENNAN, General Manager, Miami Copper Company, Miami, Arizona.

ROGERS MACVEAGH, Lawyer, Pacific Building, Portland, Oregon.

WALTER B. MAHONY, Editor, North American Review, Director, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, 9 East 37th Street, New York, N. Y.

SEVERO MALLET-PREVOST, Partner, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt and Mosle, Lawyers, 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

GEORGE D. MARKHAM, Senior Partner of W. H. Markham & Co., Insurance, 16th Floor Railway Exchange, St. Louis, Missouri.

FREDERICK ROY MARTIN, Publisher; formerly General Manager, The Associated Press, Lawrence Park West, Bronxville, N. Y.

NOEL B. MARTIN, Lawyer, formerly printer and country newspaperman, Lewiston, Idaho.

SAMUEL MATHER, Senior member, Pickands, Mather & Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Director, United States Steel Corporation, Union Trust Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

CLIFTON MATHEWS, Lawyer, Globe, Arizona.

JOHN LAWRENCE MAURAN, Mauran, Russell & Crowell, Architects, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Missouri.

HIRAM PERCY MAXIM, 410 Asylum Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

PATRICK A. MCCARRAN, Reno, Nevada.

THOMAS N. MCCARTER, 80 Park Place, Newark, New Jersey.

J. ROSS MCCULLOCH, Vice President, First National Bank of Fort Wayne, First National Bank Building, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

STUART MCGUIRE, M.D., McGuire Clinic, St. Luke's Hospital, Richmond, Virginia.

GEORGE W. MERCK, R. F. D. 129, West Orange, New Jersey.

STEPHEN O. METCALF, Woolen and Worsted Manufacturer, 15 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island.

WILLIAM H. METSON, Lawyer; Chairman, California Committee of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, Balboa Building, San Francisco, California.

DUNLEVY MILBANK, Lawyer, 52 William Street, New York, N. Y.

JOHN D. MILLER, Lawyer, 512 Whitney Building, New Orleans, Louisiana.

SIDNEY T. MILLER, Partner, Miller, Canfield, Paddock & Stone, lawyers, Detroit, Michigan, Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan.

W. W. MONTGOMERY, JR., Lawyer, 1421 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM W. MOUNTAIN, President, Mountain Varnish & Color Works, Toledo, Ohio.

GENERAL THORNWELL MULLALLY, Lawyer, Hunter Dulin Building, San Francisco, California.

FRED T. MURPHY, M.D., Trustee, 4350 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan.

GRAYSON M.-P. MURPHY, Partner, G. M.-P. Murphy & Co., bankers, 52 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

EUGENE E. NEFF, President, Neff-Stiles Co., Wholesale Builders Supplies, El Paso, Texas.

WALDO NEWCOMER, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Baltimore Trust Co., 17 South Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

SAMUEL M. NICHOLSON, Manufacturer, 23 Acorn Street, Providence, Rhode Island.

HOFFMAN NICKERSON, Author, West Shore Drive, Oyster Bay, Long Island, N. Y.

COURTLANDT NICOLL, Partner, Shiland, Hedges, Nicoll & Pelham, Lawyers, 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

W. E. NORVELL, JR., Lawyer, 709 Harry Nichol Building, Nashville, Tennessee.

T. J. O'BRIEN, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

SAMUEL H. ORDWAY, Lawyer; former Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, 72 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

NORRIS G. OSBORN, Editor, the Journal-Courier, New Haven, Connecticut.

C. A. OTIS, Otis & Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

ROBERT TREAT PAINE, II, Director of the General Electric Company, 19 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

WALTER W. PALMER, M.D., Columbia University Presbyterian Hospital, 620 West 168th Street, New York, N. Y.

WALTER PARKER, Economist, New Orleans and New York, Fenner & Beane Building, New Orleans, Louisiana.

LEWIS H. PARSONS, Partner, Graham, Parsons & Co., bankers, 1422 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

STEWART PATON, M.D., 3908 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

H. H. PATTERSON, Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

J. MEDILL PATTERSON, 247 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

GENERAL FRANCIS PEABODY, Lawyer, 10 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

RAYMOND PEARL, Biologist; Statistician; Director of the Institute for Biological Research, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

R. A. F. PENROSE, JR., Geologist and Author, Bullitt Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

SPENCER PENROSE, Capitalist, El Pomar, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

CHARLES C. PERKINS, Rancher and President of the California Lima Bean Growers' Ass'n, Camarillo, California.

CHARLES E. PERKINS, Santa Barbara, California.

JAMES J. PHELAN, Partner, Hornblower & Weeks, 60 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

WILLIAM WALTER PHELPS, President, Kettleman Oil Corporation, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

THOMAS W. PHILLIPS, JR., former member of Congress; President, T. W. Phillips Gas & Oil Co., Butler, Pennsylvania.

DR. CHARLES W. PILGRIM, Dr. MacDonald's House, Central Valley, New York.

RAYMOND PITCAIRN, Architect and Lawyer, 1830 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

EDGAR ALLAN POE, Lawyer; former Attorney-General, Maryland; Calvert & Redwood Streets, Baltimore, Maryland.

JOHN W. PRENTISS, Partner, Hornblower & Weeks, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

W. SCOTT PROSKEY, Mine Operator; Chairman, Nevada Committee of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, Reno, Nevada.

PERCY R. PYNE, 2nd, Banker, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.

CHARLES S. RACKEMANN, Lawyer; President, Constitutional Liberty League of Massachusetts, 60 Ames Building, Boston, Massachusetts.

JOHN J. RASKOB, Vice President, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. B. RAYMOND, Retired Manufacturer, Santa Barbara, California.

FERGUS REID, Norfolk, Virginia.

T. A. RIORDAN, President, Arizona Lumber and Timber Company, Flagstaff, Arizona.

LUCIUS F. ROBINSON, Partner, Robinson, Robinson and Cole, Lawyers; former President, Connecticut State Bar Association, 750 Main Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

GEORGE E. ROOSEVELT, Partner, Roosevelt and Son, bankers, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

BRONSON C. RUMSEY, Rancher, Cody, Wyoming.

BENJAMIN RUSH, President of the Insurance Company of North America and associate companies, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM E. RUSSELL, Lawyer, Webster & Atlas National Bank, 199 Washington Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

CHARLES H. SABIN, Vice Chairman of the Board of the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

MONELL SAYRE, Vice President, Church Pension Fund, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

EDWARD SCHOENECK, 1400 State Tower Building, Syracuse, New York.

HERBERT M. SEARS, Trustee, Member of the Executive Committee, New England Trust Co., 53 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

J. J. SEELMAN, M.D., Specialist in diagnosis and internal medicine; Member, Wisconsin State Board of Health, 69 E. Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN, McVickar Professor of Political Economy, Columbia University, 324 West 86th Street, New York, N. Y.

JOHN L. SEVERANCE, Retired, 480 The Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio.
CECIL F. SHALLCROSS, Insurance, 150 William Street, New York, N. Y.
A. L. SHAPLEIGH, Chairman of the Board, Shapleigh Hardware Company, St. Louis, Missouri.
QUINCY A. SHAW, 14 Ashburton Place, Boston, Massachusetts.
RALPH M. SHAW, First National Bank Building, Chicago, Illinois.
SAMUEL SLOAN, Vice President, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, 43 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
F. DUMONT SMITH, First National Bank Building, Hutchinson, Kansas.
GEORGE T. SMITH, President and Director, Joseph Dixon Crucible Company, Jersey City, New Jersey.
WILLIAM P. SMITH, Vice President, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, 21 E. 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
NIKOLAI SOKOLOFF, 1220 Huron Road, Cleveland, Ohio.
FREDERIC E. SONDERN, M.D., Clinical Pathologist; Member of Public Health Relations Committee; New York Academy of Medicine, 20 West 55th Street, New York, N. Y.
SIDNEY SPITZER, Capitalist, The Nicholas Building Company, Toledo, Ohio.
FRANK SPURLOCK, Chattanooga, Tennessee.
E. MACD. STANTON, M.D., Surgeon, Medical Arts Building, Schenectady, New York.
W. H. STAYTON, Former United States Naval officer; Chairman of the Board, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
CHARLES W. STERLING, Lawyer, Sterling, Converse & Spence, Merchants Bank Building, St. Paul, Minnesota.
WALTER W. STETTHEIMER, President, Neustadter Brothers, 62 First Street, San Francisco, California.
PERCY S. STRAUS, Vice President, R. H. Macy and Co., 151 West 34th Street, New York, N. Y.
MATT. I. SULLIVAN, Lawyer, 1108 Humboldt Building, San Francisco, California.
ALFRED H. SWAYNE, Vice President, General Motors Corporation, 1775 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

JAMES A. TALBOT, Chairman of the Board, Richfield Oil Company of California, Bartlett Bldg., 7th and Spring Streets, Los Angeles, California.
AUGUSTUS THOMAS, Playwright, 11 Thomas Place, New Rochelle, N. Y.
ALEXANDER M. TUTHILL, M.D., Phoenix, Arizona.
JAMES TWOHY, Contractor, Care of Twohy Brothers, Portland, Oregon.

JOHN R. UMSTED, Vice President, Continental-Equitable Title and Trust Company, 21 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

JOSEPH L. VALENTINE, Trustee, 100 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH, JR., Farmer, Geneseo, N. Y.
WILLIAM BELL WAIT, Partner, Wait & Johnston, lawyers, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.
GEORGE H. WALKER, President, W. A. Harriman & Co., bankers, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
WILLIAM I. WALTER, Retired; Director, Lawyers Mortgage Co., 2 East 55th Street, New York, N. Y.
BENTLEY W. WARREN, Partner, Warren, Garfield, Whiteside & Lamson, lawyers, Boston, Massachusetts.
JAMES E. WELLS, Vice President, The Marine Trust Company of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York.
COLONEL ALEX. M. WETHERILL, U. S. A. R. C., Stuart Building, Seattle, Washington.
W. CHATTIN WETHERILL, 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
G. W. WILDER, East Rindge, New Hampshire.
LINSLY R. WILLIAMS, M.D., Director, New York Academy of Medicine, 5th Avenue and 103rd Street, New York, N. Y.
MATTHEW WOLL, Vice President, American Federation of Labor, 210 American Federation of Labor Bldg., Washington, D. C.
KENNETH A. WOOD, Member, New York Stock Exchange, 287 Main Street, Buffalo, New York.
ERNEST L. WOODWARD, Farmer, Le Roy, N. Y.
R. CHARLTON WRIGHT, Publisher, 33 Tacoma Street, Asheville, North Carolina.
MAJOR-GENERAL W. M. WRIGHT, United States Army, retired, 3028 Q Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment

●

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PIERRE S. DUPONT, *Chairman*
BENEDICT CROWELL
HENRY H. CURRAN
IRENEE DUPONT
GRAYSON M.-P. MURPHY
CHARLES H. SABIN
W. H. STAYTON
JAMES W. WADSWORTH, JR.

Chairman, Board of Directors

W. H. STAYTON
Washington, D. C.

President

HENRY H. CURRAN
21 East 40th Street
New York, N. Y.

Vice-Presidents

JOHN C. GEBHART
G. C. HINCKLEY
LOUIS LIVINGSTON
LARKIN G. MEAD
W. SCOTT PROSKEY
J. J. SEELMAN, M.D.
WILLIAM P. SMITH
CHARLES S. WOOD

Treasurer

CHARLES H. SABIN
21 East 40th Street
New York, N. Y.

Secretary

EMMET DOUGHERTY
National Press Building
Washington, D. C.

PAMPHLETS AVAILABLE

On application, any of the following pamphlets will be mailed, free of charge:

Eighteenth Amendment Not a Remedy for the Drink Evil. By Pierre S. duPont.

The Quebec System; a study in liquor control.

Annual Report for 1929.

Scandals of Prohibition Enforcement.

Cost of Prohibition and Your Income Tax.

Canada Liquor Crossing the Border.

Measuring the Liquor Tide.

Government Liquor Control in Canada.

Reforming America with a Shot Gun.

The Last Outposts of Prohibition in Canada.

The Bratt System of Liquor Control in Sweden.

A Business Man's View of Prohibition. By Pierre S. duPont.

Finland's Prohibition.

IN PREPARATION

Reports on other pressing phases of the liquor problem will be published from time to time. Among those now in preparation are field studies of the liquor problem in Great Britain, Norway, Denmark and Western Europe. We shall issue soon an analysis of the economic effects of Prohibition in the United States.

BOOKS AVAILABLE

The A. B. C. of Prohibition. By Fabian Franklin; Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Prohibition or Control—Canada's Experience with the Liquor Problem; by Reginald E. Hose; Longmans, Green & Co.

Drink: Coercion or Control? by Rheta Childe Dorr; Stokes.

Write to

ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT

21 E. 40th Street **New York, N. Y.**

MSH #24053

END OF
TITLE